

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached one (1) sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 5. The replacement sheet, which includes Fig. 5 and 6, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 5 and 6. In Fig. 5, an additional storage medium 525 has been added as described in the specification. No new matter has been added.

Attachment: One (1) replacement sheet.

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1, 8, 16, 17, 27, 33 and 35 have been amended. Claims 1-35 are pending. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the present application is requested.

With regards to claim 8, the Examiner will note the claim has been amended to depend from claim 7, obviating the objection to this claim. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

With regards to claim 16, the Examiner will note the claim has been amended, obviating the rejection of this claim. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statements, PTO 1449 papers and cited references.

Applicants have included the complete "Rating System" article and the Weinberg, J. reference along with a supplemental Information Disclosure Statement and PTO 1449 paper.

II. Objection to the Title

With regards to the objection to the title, the Examiner will note that the title has been amended herein, thereby obviating the present objection. Withdrawal of this objection is therefore respectfully requested.

III. Objection to the Drawings

With regards to the objection to the drawings, Figure 5 has been amended. No new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 13, 16-18, 24 and 33-35 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 13, 16-18, 24 and 33-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0014751 ("Paek"). It is respectfully submitted that Paek does not render unpatentable the present claims for at least the following reasons.

To anticipate a claim, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be found in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif., 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). That is, the prior art must describe the elements arranged as required by the

claims. In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831 (Fed. Cir. 1990). It is respectfully submitted that Paek does not teach each and every limitation of amended claim 1 for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, in relevant part, providing a default profile including at least one filtering criterion, the filtering criterion describing at least one of a characteristic of content permitted for all of the plurality of users and a characteristic of content prohibited for all of the plurality of users, wherein **the filtering criterion includes at least one of a name of an actor and a name of a director**. Paek generally describes restricting the playback of a DVD based on one or more parental levels in the DVD system, controlled by user passwords. Paek fails to describe filtering criterion including **actor** or **director** information and fails to disclose every element of amended claim 1.

As for claims 2-3, 7, 8, 13 and 16, which ultimately depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Paek does not render unpatentable these dependent claims for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above.

Claim 17 has been amended to recite, in relevant part, a memory device storing a default profile, the default profile including at least one filtering criterion, the filtering criterion of the default profile describing at least one of a characteristic of content permitted for all of the plurality of users and a characteristic of content prohibited for all of the plurality of users, wherein **the filtering criterion includes at least one of a name of an actor and a name of a director**. As discussed above, Paek fails to describe filtering criterion including actor or director information. Thus, Paek fails to disclose every element of amended claim 17.

As for claims 18 and 24, which ultimately depend from claim 17 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 17, it is respectfully submitted that Paek does not render unpatentable these dependent claims for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above.

Claim 33 has been amended to recite, in relevant part, comparing the metadata to at least one stored filtering criterion, the filtering criterion describing a characteristic of at least one of permitted and prohibited content, wherein **the filtering criterion includes at least one of a name of an actor and a name of a director**. As discussed above, Paek fails to describe filtering criterion including actor or director information. Thus, Paek fails to disclose every element of amended claim 33.

As for claim 34, which depends from claim 33 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 33, it is respectfully submitted that Paek does not render unpatentable claim 33 for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above.

Claim 35 has been amended to recite, in relevant part, a processor configured to compare at least one stored filtering criterion with metadata associated with selected content, and to permit or deny rendering of the selected content based on the comparison, wherein **the filtering criterion includes at least one of a name of an actor and a name of a director**. As discussed above, Paek fails to describe filtering criterion including actor or director information. Thus, Paek fails to disclose every element of amended claim 35.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 1-5, 12, 14, 16, 17, 21, 24, 25 and 33-35 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-5, 12, 14, 16, 17, 21, 24, 25 and 33-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,785,901 ("Horiwitz et al."). It is respectfully submitted that Horiwitz et al. does not render unpatentable the present claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, in relevant part, providing a default profile including at least one filtering criterion, the filtering criterion describing at least one of a characteristic of content permitted for all of the plurality of users and a characteristic of content prohibited for all of the plurality of users, wherein **the filtering criterion includes at least one of a name of an actor and a name of a director**. Horiwitz et al. generally describes locking and unlocking programming content by using the content of an electronic programming guide. Programming content can be locked based on characteristics of the programming content such as the duration, start times, end times, content descriptors and ratings of the programming content. Horiwitz et al., Abstract. Thus, Horiwitz et al. fails to describe filtering criterion including **actor or director** information and fails to disclose every element of amended claim 1.

As for claims 2-5, 12, 14 and 16, which ultimately depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Horiwitz et al. does not render unpatentable these dependent claims for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above.

Claim 17 has been amended to recite, in relevant part, a memory device storing a default profile, the default profile including at least one filtering criterion, the filtering

criterion of the default profile describing at least one of a characteristic of content permitted for all of the plurality of users and a characteristic of content prohibited for all of the plurality of users, wherein **the filtering criterion includes at least one of a name of an actor and a name of a director**. As discussed above, Horiwitz et al. fails to describe filtering criterion including actor or director information. Thus, Horiwitz et al. fails to disclose every element of amended claim 17.

As for claims 21 and 24, which ultimately depend from claim 17 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 17, it is respectfully submitted that Horiwitz et al. does not render unpatentable these dependent claims for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above.

Claim 33 has been amended to recite, in relevant part, comparing the metadata to at least one stored filtering criterion, the filtering criterion describing a characteristic of at least one of permitted and prohibited content, wherein **the filtering criterion includes at least one of a name of an actor and a name of a director**. As discussed above, Horiwitz et al. fails to describe filtering criterion including actor or director information. Thus, Horiwitz et al. fails to disclose every element of amended claim 33.

As for claim 34, which depends from claim 33 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 33, it is respectfully submitted that Horiwitz et al. does not render unpatentable claim 33 for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above.

Claim 35 has been amended to recite, in relevant part, a processor configured to compare at least one stored filtering criterion with metadata associated with selected content, and to permit or deny rendering of the selected content based on the comparison, wherein **the filtering criterion includes at least one of a name of an actor and a name of a director**. As discussed above, Horiwitz et al. fails to describe filtering criterion including actor or director information. Thus, Horiwitz et al. fails to disclose every element of amended claim 35.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claims 6 and 26 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Horiwitz et al. and U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0088420 (“alSafadi et al.”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horiwitz et al. and alSafadi et al. does not render unpatentable the present claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 12 depends from claim 1 and therefore includes all of the features recited in claim 1, and claim 26 depends from claim 17 and therefore includes all of the features recited in claim 17. As more fully set forth above, Horiwitz et al. does not render unpatentable claims 1 and 17. alSafadi et al. does not cure the critical deficiencies set forth above. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horiwitz et al. and alSafadi et al. does not render unpatentable claim 6, which depends from claim 1, or claim 26, which depends from claim 17.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VII. Rejection of Claims 9-11, 22, 23 and 27-32 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 9-11, 22, 23 and 27-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Horiwitz et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,704,929 ("Ozer et al."). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horiwitz et al. and Ozer et al. does not render unpatentable the present claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 9-11 ultimately depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 1, claims 22 and 23 depend from claim 17 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 17. As more fully set forth above, Horiwitz et al. does not render unpatentable claims 1 and 17. Ozer et al. does not cure the critical deficiencies set forth above. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horiwitz et al. and Ozer et al. does not render unpatentable claims 9-11, which depend from claim 1, or claims 22 and 23, which depend from claim 17.

Claim 27 recites, in relevant part, permitting or denying access to the selected content based on the comparison, wherein **the filtering criterion includes at least one of a name of an actor and a name of a director**. Horiwitz et al. generally describes locking and unlocking programming content by using the content of an electronic programming guide. Programming content can be locked based on characteristics of the programming content such as the duration, start times, end times, content descriptors and ratings of the programming content. Horiwitz et al., Abstract. Thus, Horiwitz et al. fails to describe filtering criterion including **actor** or **director** information and fails to disclose every element of amended claim 27. Ozer et al. does not cure the critical deficiencies set forth above. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horiwitz et al. and Ozer et al. does not render unpatentable claim 27. For at least the same reasons, the combination of Horiwitz et al. and Ozer et al. does not render unpatentable claims 28 and 29, which depend from claim 27, and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 27.

As discussed above, Horiwitz et al. does not render unpatentable claim 30. Ozer et al. does not cure the critical deficiencies set forth above. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horiwitz et al. and Ozer et al. does not render unpatentable claim 30. For at least the same reasons, the combination of Horiwitz et al. Orzer et al. does not render unpatentable claims 31 and 32, which depend from claim 30, and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 30.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VIII. Rejection of Claim 15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Horiwitz et al. and U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0014750 (“Kamen”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horiwitz et al. and Kamen does not render unpatentable the present claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 15 ultimately depends from claim 1 and therefore includes all of the features recited in claim 1. As more fully set forth above, Horiwitz et al. does not render unpatentable claim 1. Kamen does not cure the critical deficiencies set forth above. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horiwitz et al. and Kamen does not render unpatentable claim 15, which depends from claim 1.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2 Aug, 2006

By:



Michelle Carniaux
Reg. No. 36,098

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO 26646